

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This Amendment is being filed in response to the Office Action dated September 15, 2010. Reconsideration and allowance of the application in view of the amendments made above and the remarks to follow are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-20 are pending in the Application. Claims 1, 4, 8, and 13 are independent claims.

In the Office Action, claims 1-7 and 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101. This rejection of claims 1-7 and 17-18 is respectfully traversed. However, in the interest of advancing prosecution, claim 1 is amended to clarify that the method for playing content is performed on the playback device. It is respectfully submitted that claim 1 clearly is directed to statutory subject matter. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the subject matter of claims 1-7 and 17-18 is statutory and it is respectfully requested that this rejection under 35 U.S.C. §101 be withdrawn.

In the Office Action, claims 1-2, 4-5, 8-11 and 13-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 7,379,661 to Lamkin ("Lamkin"). Claims 3, 6-7 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Lamkin in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,286,747 to Lewis ("Lewis"). These rejections are respectfully traversed. It is respectfully submitted that claims 1-20 are allowable over Lamkin alone and in view of Lewis for at least the following reasons.

The claims are amended to further clarify that (illustrative emphasis added) "the plurality of distinct branches leading to a respective plurality of diverged endings of the content story line". The plurality of distinct branches are described in the first paragraph of

the Background of the Invention section of the specification as follows (illustrative emphasis added):

a movie may be made with several ends, thus can be played in several branches for the user to choose, and each branch leads to a different end of the movie, so that the user can see different ends of the same movie in different branches according to their own preferences.

In a further example the specification states (illustrative emphasis added):

the tutorial for learning may be edited into different branches for the user to choose according to their levels, so that the users can choose the branch leading to the level needed to learn according to their levels and preferences.

The present amendment clarifies that each branch of the claims includes a unique story line ending. It is respectfully submitted that this is not taught, described, or suggested in Lamkin.

The angles of Lamkin, are not defined anywhere in its specification. As best understood, the angles are different perspectives of the same scene. Therefore, as argued in the previous amendment, regardless of the selected angle or perspective of some scenes, the story line of the content is the same. Thus Lamkin does not teach, describe, or suggest "the plurality of distinct branches leading to a respective plurality of diverged endings of the content story line", as recited in claim 1. In Lamkin, even when different angles are selected, the story line converges to the same end. Accordingly, it is again respectfully submitted that the different angles of Lamkin are not analogous to the "plurality of distinct branches" of the present claims.

Further, for the simple reason that the branches, having the above established meaning, are missing from Lamkin, that reference does not anticipate or makes obvious the

acts of detecting a branch indication and creating a bookmark corresponding to the detected branch indication, as in claim 1. It is respectfully submitted that Lamkin merely shows a conventional usage of bookmarks that are used to indicate where a video player was last on a singular story line.

It is respectfully submitted that the method of claim 1 is not anticipated or made obvious by the teachings of Lamkin. For example, Lamkin does not teach, disclose or suggest, amongst other patentable elements, (illustrative emphasis added) "method for playing content having a story line including a plurality of distinct branches on a playback device, the plurality of distinct branches leading to a respective plurality of diverged endings of the content story line, the method comprising acts of: on the playback device: detecting a branch indication while playing the content, the branch indication identifying a branch of the plurality of distinct branches of the content selected for playback; and creating a bookmark corresponding to the detected branch indication to record relevant information of said branch indication including which one of the plurality of distinct branches to continue for playing the content, wherein each branch indication of the played content has a corresponding created bookmark, wherein subsequent playing of the content is guided by the created bookmarks" as recited in claim 1, and as similarly recited in claims 4, 8, and 13.

Lewis is introduced for showing elements of dependent claims and does not remedy the deficiencies of Lamkin with respect to the independent claims.


Based on the foregoing, the Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 4, 8 and 13 are patentable over Lamkin and notice to this effect is earnestly solicited. Claims 2-3, 5-7, 9-12 and 14-20 respectively depend from one of claims 1, 4, 8 and 13 and

accordingly are allowable for at least this reason as well as for the separately patentable elements contained in each of the claims. Accordingly, separate consideration of each of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

In addition, Applicants deny any statement, position, or averment of the Examiner that is not specifically addressed by the foregoing argument and response. Any rejections and/or points of argument not addressed would appear to be moot in view of the presented remarks. However, the Applicants reserve the right to submit further arguments in support of the above stated position, should that become necessary. No arguments are waived and none of the Examiner's statements are conceded.

Applicants have made a diligent and sincere effort to place this application in condition for immediate allowance and notice to this effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Gregory L. Thorne, Reg. 39,398
Attorney for Applicant(s)
December 10, 2010

THORNE & HALAJIAN, LLP

111 West Main Street
Bay Shore, NY 11706
Tel: (631) 665-5139
Fax: (631) 665-5101

Please direct all inquiries and correspondence to:

Michael E. Belk, Reg. 33,357
Philips Intellectual Property & Standards
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001
(914) 333-9643